DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 033 EA 031 735

AUTHOR	Wolverton, Mimi; Macdonald, R. Timothy
TITLE	The Northwest's Phantom Pool: Superintendent Certificate Holders Who Do Not Plan To Apply and Why.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Experience; Employment Patterns; *Job Applicants; Job Satisfaction; Job Security; Labor Needs; Labor Turnover; *Occupational Information; *Superintendents; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	*Pacific Northwest

ABSTRACT

A recent national study suggests that 80 percent of current superintendents are at or near retirement. To compound the problem of a shrinking pool of candidates, highly qualified potential applicants often simply do not want the job. This report focuses on the aspects of the positions that serve as disincentives to seemingly qualified candidates. More than 1,900 superintendents and superintendent certificate holders in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington were surveyed early in 2000. Responses suggest that fewer than 25 percent of sitting superintendents were under the age of 50 in the year 2000, and that 40 percent of those 50 years or older planned to retire within the next 4 years. While the pool of potential applicants includes over 1,000 superintendent certificate holders, fewer than 150 of respondents in this study planned to apply for upcoming vacancies. Reasons for not applying include stresses created by politics, the media, boards with individually vested interests, inadequate salary, position instability, and enjoyment of and at the current job. At present, school districts may need to recognize that they will continue to have an aging superintendency, unless the position can be restructured in a way that affords a better balance between professional and personal lives for superintendents. (Contains 34 references and 2 tables.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 033

The Northwest's Phantom Pool: Superintendent Certificate Holders Who Do Not Plan to Apply and Why

by

Mimi Wolverton and R. Timothy Macdonald

Abstract

Responses gathered in a recent study of the superintendency in the Pacific Northwest suggest that less than 25% of sitting superintendents in the year 2000 were under the age of 50; and 40% of those who were 50 years or older planned to retire within the next four years. While the pool of potential applicants includes over 1,000 superintendent certificate holders, fewer than 150 of respondents in the same study planned to apply for upcoming vacancies. This paper examines aspects of the position that serve as disincentives to seemingly qualified candidates.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. WOLVERTON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA031 735

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Northwest's Phantom Pool: Superintendent Certificate Holders Who Do Not Plan to Apply and Why

by

Mimi Wolverton and R. Timothy Macdonald

A recent national study suggests that 80% of current superintendents are at or near retirement. Sixty-eight percent of these superintendents are between the ages of 50 and 59 years; another 10 to 15% are over 60 (Cooper, Fusarelli & Carella, 2000). This is not simply a big-city or large-district phenomenon. The graying of the superintendency extends to rural America as well. In *The Superintendent Pool: Realities in the Northwest*, researchers report that in the five-state region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington) less than 25% of sitting superintendents in the year 2000 were under the age of 50; and 40% of those who were 50 years or older planned to retire within the next four years (Wolverton, Rawls & Macdonald, 2000). If the more than 500 superintendents (60% of all superintendents in the region) who participated in the study are representative of the region, the Pacific Northwest may experience a sizeable exodus from superintendent positions by the year 2005.

What about the Applicant Pool?

Anecdotal data suggests that fewer individuals today apply for administrative jobs than in the past (AASA, 1999). Executive search firms across the country contend that the pool is not only smaller, but weaker. Only one in ten applicants, they say, is actually qualified to do the job (Cunningham & Burdick, 1999). Nationally, 88% of superintendents who were surveyed suggested that districts are, indeed, experiencing applicant shortages (Cooper, Fusarelli & Carella 2000). Highly qualified candidates

often simply do not want the job (McAdams, 1998). The Pacific Northwest is not immune to such problems. At a meeting sponsored several years ago by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, participants from the five-state region bemoaned the fact that "there used to be 75 to100 applicants per job. Now there [were] 20 with 5 good ones" (NWREL, 1996). A subsequent study in the state of Washington lent credence to this claim. Researchers found that fewer than 30% of its potential pool of applicants intended to apply for a superintendency. And even if they applied, many of them indicated that they would retire within five years (Rawls, 1998).

Although government sources suggest that nationally the number of currently licensed individuals is adequate to fill administrative vacancies at all levels through 2005 (Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000), these individuals often fail to enter the administrative ranks, especially the superintendency (Forsyth, 1999). This is the case in the Pacific Northwest. Each year, superintendent certificate programs in the region graduate potential applicants in excess of the positions that are available. The size of the certificated pool is important in the Northwest because four of the five states require a certificate upon application[1] (Rawls, 1998; Wolverton, Rawls, Macdonald & Nelson, 2000).

In the Northwest, over 1,000 districts are headed by 820 superintendents (some hold joint appointments across districts). In any given year, certificate holders who are not superintendents number in excess of 1,000. About one-quarter of these certificate holders are already retired but still employed in administrative positions other than the

---

[1] In Washington, the only state that does not require certification, about 20% of the superintendents function with either expired certificates or none at all.

superintendency. In the 2000 Northwest superintendency study, less than one-third of the remaining superintendent certificate holders planned to apply for a superintendency within three years. In concrete terms, 191 superintendents planned to retire by the year 2003, and only 119 nonsuperintendents planned to apply for their positions. Unless, more current certificate holders decide to apply for the superintendency or the number of qualified applicants substantially increases, applicant pools will be thin. Some of the more remote districts may not even be able to generate a viable group of candidates.

This paper focuses on the factors that serve as disincentives to potential candidates as they consider whether or not to apply for the superintendency. It draws on research commissioned by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory and frames the discussion using various motivation theories to provide insight into why certificate holders do not seek the position.

The Study

Early in 2000, Washington State University's Center for Academic Leadership surveyed over 1,900 superintendents and superintendent certificate holders in the five-state region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington) served by the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (Wolverton, Rawls & Macdonald, 2000). The survey comprised of three sections. The first section asked for general demographic information, such as current position, education, income, whether a respondent had ever applied for a superintendent position (and if so how many times), and whether he/she planned to apply for position by 2005. Depending on the answer to this last question, respondents completed one of two inventories that detailed possible reasons for applying or not applying for the position. In each instance, using a 5-point likert-like scale (where

1 signifies very unimportant and 5 very important), respondents rated a combination of items that could serve as either incentives or disincentives in the decision.

The items in both inventories derive from the National AASA survey instrument (Glass, 1992) and state-specific surveys conducted in New York (O'Connell, 1992), Nebraska (Dlugosh, 1994), Wisconsin (Price, 1992), and Louisiana (Jordan, McCauley & Comeau, 1994). The inventories were piloted in a 1997 study conducted in the state of Washington (Rawls, 1998). In the pilot study, two variables in each inventory emerged as unidimensional, and in the more comprehensive regional study were considered unique and omitted from the inventories. In the inventory (reasons not to apply), the results of which are reported in this paper, availability of district in terms of size and location were treated as unique, but correlated to each other. Another unique variable, enjoy current position, also influenced potential applicants' decisions. (For a discussion of the responses to the "will apply" inventory, see Wolverton, Rawls, and Macdonald, 2000).

The 1,900 superintendents and superintendent certificate holders who were surveyed, roughly represent the entire population of certificate holders in the five-state region. The decision to conduct a census was made primarily because of inconsistencies in record keeping across states. Although a reliable random sample, which would produce a sample of sufficient size, could have been drawn for Oregon and Washington, researchers could not be sure of similar results in the other three states. Each state could provide addresses for its superintendents but not necessarily for its certificate holders. To complicate matters further, Alaska has only 53 districts and suffers from yearly turnover rates of up to 50% in both the superintendent and certificate holder ranks.

Conducting a census guaranteed that response rates by state would be sufficient to conduct the analyses desired by NWREL. Surveys were administered using Dillman's (1978) total design survey method. The regional response rate for both superintendents and certificate holders was 60%.

In the remainder of this paper, the authors examine the responses of those nonsuperintendent certificate holders who could apply, if they desired to, for a superintendency. Of the 658 nonsuperintendent respondents, 150 were retired, and another 137 planned to retire by the year 2004. We considered the remaining 371 certificate holders as a viable applicant pool for upcoming superintendent vacancies in the region.

Profile of the Viable Pool in the Pacific Northwest

Sixty-eight percent of the 371 certificate holders considered as potentially viable candidates were men. About 7% of the pool carried minority status. The mean age of members in the applicant pool was 50 years. In general, respondents had participated in graduate education beyond the masters level. They averaged almost 15 years of administrative experience and had been in their current positions roughly 6 years. One-half of the respondents had earned their certificates prior to 1988 (all but one were certified). Women tended to possess less administrative experience, had been in their current positions for slightly less time, and their certification was, on average, about two years more recent. At the time of the study, most pool members were either elementary or high school principals (38%), assistant superintendents (18%), or members of central administration (31%). Women were less likely to be high school principals and more likely to be in central administration positions. Seventy percent of the potential

applicants worked in districts of 2,000 students or more. A slightly higher percentage of women were located in larger districts than were men.

Of the 287 respondents who answered the question: have you ever applied for a superintendency–184 (64%) said yes. Over three-quarter of the men in this group had applied. Less than 40% of the women had done the same. Of those who applied, 73% had been interviewed, and 83% of those who were interviewed were offered superintendencies. However, over 90% of those who were offered positions were men. Another way to say this is that 94% of the men who applied said they were offered jobs. Only 41% of the women who were interviewed were offered positions.

Only 131 members of this pool (35%) planned to apply for a superintendency within five years. Overwhelmingly, the reasons they gave for applying stemmed from a desire to grow, achieve, meet new challenges, and develop oneself–all self-actualizing motives (Wolverton, Rawls, Macdonald, and Nelson, 2000). Sixty-five percent (240) of the viable pool (371 certificate holders) does not intend to apply. Our greatest concerns lie with this group and in trying to determine why they chose not to go into the superintendency. (Table 1 provides a summary of the profile data.)

Career Motivation: When Characteristics of a Profession Become Disincentives

Motivation theories strive to explain human behavior. They can, in general terms, be divided into three categories–content, process, and environmental. Content theories look at what energizes behavior; process theories take into consideration the factors that direct behavior; and environmental theories focus on how individuals sustain behavior over time (Bowditch and Buono, 1997).

Popular content theories include Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Alderfer's ERG Theory, and McClelland's Socially Acquired Needs Theory. Maslow (1954) postulated that five basic needs drive human behavior–physiological, security, social, esteem, and self-actualization–and that these needs form a sort of hierarchy in which lower needs, such as food, shelter, and safety, must be met before an individual's behavior is motivated by needs for social interaction, recognition, or self-development. Alderfer (1972) collapsed Maslow's levels into three categories–basic existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth or achievement needs. He suggested that needs are not progressively staged but can overlap. That indeed, people might shift back and forth between levels without fully satisfying one level before moving on to the next. McClelland (1961), too, arrived at a system of three basic needs–achievement, power, and affiliation. Needs, as McClelland defined them, are culturally based, not necessarily instinctive but learned. For him, needs vary in strength over time and across situations. Individuals, however, tend toward one set of needs more than the others, depending on personal disposition and life experience.

Typically, superintendents begin their careers as education professionals as teachers. So, in seeking to understand what motivates individuals to become superintendents, determining why they became teachers is one place to start. Studies, over time, have been relatively consistent in explaining why people become teachers. Overwhelmingly, teachers became teachers because they wanted to help children achieve (ACE, 1990; Bauman, 1990; Berg, Coker & Reno, 1992; Clarke & Keating, 1995; Farkas, Johnson & Foleno, 2000; Fuller, 1990; Metrolpolitan Life, 1990). Some suggested that they were drawn to teaching because they relate easily to children

(Bauman, 1990). Others cited a desire to combine career and family options, referring specifically to the flexibility that nine- or ten-month contracts provide when trying to raise their own children and engage in activities, such as family vacations, holiday celebrations, and after-school events (Bauman, 1990; Farkas et al., 2000). A few spoke to the advantage of working with other like-minded people and collegiality (Berg, Coker & Reno, 1992; Fuller, 1990). In a recent study, 84% of those surveyed said they enjoyed the job security that teaching provides, and two-thirds of them felt that the position gives them a sense of being respected and appreciated (Farkas et al., 2000). Over 95% of new teachers in the same study said that they teach because the love to do it.

Clearly, content motivation theories explain a good portion of what attracts people to the profession of teaching. Maslow's survival needs and Alderfer's existence needs for shelter, food, and security are met by the mere fact of having a job. The manifestation of affiliation needs in teachers, whether innate (Maslow and Alderfer) or acquired (McClelland) appear quite strong in terms of wanting to work with children and, to a lesser extent, enjoying the contact they have with colleagues. And, the desire to be respected and appreciated seems to indicate that Maslow's self-esteem need is being met. In addition, "much of a person's self-actualizing behavior [in McClelland and Alderfer's words, the need for achievement, growth, and development] is motivated by the sheer enjoyment obtained from realizing and developing his[her] capabilities" (Lawler, 1994, p. 30; Maslow, 1954). Teachers, especially new ones, love their work (Farkas et al., 2000). Although a portion of this engagement in teaching is driven by a love of children, it makes sense that they find teaching a rewarding profession because it challenges them to reach their potential–to grow beyond themselves.

Teachers do not wake up one morning and say I'm going to apply for the superintendency. Most of them move first to a principalship or other mid-level administrative position. Recent research suggests that having satisfied their lower-order needs, teachers who plan to move into principalships revisit their achievement, growth, and self-actualization needs (Harris, Arnold, Lowery & Crocker, 2000; Parkay & Hall, 1992). The most important factors in the decision to pursue principal certification seem to revolve around making a difference and being challenged to grow, both personally and professionally. The prospect of salary increases also provides impetus to enter administration, which may indicate that lower-order needs can coincide with higher-order ones. Status, prestige, and using the principalship as a stepping stone to a higher administrative position, which reflect potential self-esteem [Maslow] or power [McClelland] needs, are some of the least important factors in their decision (Harris et al., 2000; Lonardi, Willower & Bredeson, 1995).

The power that undergirds the superintendency, in general, could provide some impetus for school administrators to move into the superintendency, but research typically either does not address this issue or suggests that raw power, alone, is not a sufficient incentive. Many studies do suggest that individuals seek the superintendency because it affords them the opportunity to exercise leadership. How these individuals define leadership opportunity is unclear, but it could implicitly include a desire for power (Glass, Björk, & Brunner, 2000; Wolverton, Rawls & Macdonald, 2000). Power can, however, be viewed negatively. For instance, the prospect of added exposure to the media, increased stress associated with increased responsibility, and the uncertainty of dealing with politically charged issues and school boards, all trappings of power in the

superintendency, could serve as disincentives to those who might otherwise aspire to the position.

Process theories of motivation, particularly expectancy and equity theories, also shed light on why principals and other mid-level administrators might choose to become superintendents (Adams, 1963; Lawler, 1994; Vroom, 1964). The most commonly cited expectancy theory is Vroom's VIE Theory. Vroom suggested that for a person to be motivated to engage in a particular behavior, he/she must believe that if he/she puts in the necessary effort, he/she can do the job; that if the person performs well, he/she will be rewarded; and that the reward has value or is attractive. In the case of the superintendency, applicants must want to be superintendents and believe that they can be effective in the position if they expend the energy necessary to do the job; and they must believe that the reward (whether in terms of salary, prestige, respect, or self-development) justifies the effort. If any aspects of the process are looked upon as undesirable, then individuals are disinclined to engage in the desired behavior (applying for the superintendency).

Equity theory focuses primarily on the reward aspects of the motivation process. Its underlying assumption is that individuals want to be treated equitably at work. Strictly speaking, individuals work in exchange for rewards. According to this theory, if an individual's counterpart earns more for the same level of effort or if an individual expends a great deal more effort than a subordinate but believes that the difference in compensation does not adequately reflect the increased effort, then the reward system becomes a disincentive to moving into a position of more authority and responsibility (Adams, 1963). Based on equity theory, a principal or central administrator may choose

not to pursue the superintendency, or a superintendent may leave the position, simply because gains associated with the position do not reflect equitable compensation for the effort deemed necessary to do the job.

Content and process theories of motivation, then, help expose aspects of the superintendency that could be viewed as disincentives and reasons why individuals choose not to apply. Indeed, two recent studies, in which superintendents were surveyed, found that board/superintendent disharmony, small pay differentials between the superintendency and other administrative positions, and issues of comparable worth with private sector CEOs were major contributors to high turnover rates and sparse applicant pools (Cooper, Fusarelli & Carella, 2000; Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000). In these particular instances, disharmony counters the need for affiliation (Maslow, Alderfer, and McClellend), and concerns about small pay differentials and comparable worth (Vroom and Adams) serve as disincentives to many who might otherwise be interested in becoming superintendents.

A final type of motivation theory also provides insights into why individuals do not to apply for the superintendency, or choose to leave it after they successfully attained it. Environmentally based theories take into account how an individual's surroundings impact his/her decisions. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), for example, suggests that individuals engage in three human processes—vicarious learning, use of symbolism, and self-control. Bandura claimed that individuals learn vicariously by accepting the experiences of others as their own. Symbolism, under this theory, resembles a form of scenario building where individuals think through and play out in their minds various options that surround a particular situation. In the end, based on conclusions drawn

during vicarious learning and from the use of symbolism, these individuals may choose not to engage in certain behaviors. In the case of aspiring superintendents, they can learn quite a bit by watching those already in the position. They may also engage in symbolism by envisioning problems in the superintendency as their own. Finally, they can exercise self-control by not applying for the position.

Analysis of Data

To gain an understanding of why presumably qualified individuals are not motivated to pursue the position, the dimensionality of the data collected from the 240 individuals in the study who did not plan to apply for a superintendency was reduced using principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. In this analysis, factors carrying eigenvalues greater than one were initially considered to be significant (Hair et al, 1992). The resulting dimensions of the construct "will not apply" are presented in Table 2. An additional variable, "enjoy current position," also seemed to weigh heavily in the decision. When ranked by mean, this variable carried the highest score ($\bar{x}$ = 3.91; 1 low, 5 high) overall. The next highest mean score for an individual variable (am place bound) was 3.46. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for variables loading most heavily on each factor to determine the reliability of the inventory (Noursis, 1994). The first factor to emerge carries the greatest predictive reliability, as do the variables loading most heavily on a particular factor.

The factor, which explained most of the common variance in the data (R^2 = 28%, alpha = .84), reflects many of the negative realities associated with the job. Items contributing to this factor include media image, fluctuating relationships with the community, maintaining relations with school boards, stress, politics, position insecurity,

dealing with collective bargaining, funding instability, and low pay differential from current position. The second factor to materialize points to individual issues of support and image. It accounted for 12% of the variance in the data (alpha = .68). The four variables loading on this factor are lack of mentor support, lack of self confidence, weak certification program, and lack of affirmative action. The final factor to emerge focuses on family considerations (being place bound, spouse's job, children in school). It accounted for 10% of the variance in the data (alpha = .58). The three factors loaded similarly for men and women, although the second and third factors emerged in reverse order for women in the pool. Note: although the variables loading on the last two factors appear to be reasonable groupings, the factors are less reliable than factor one; and their relatively low reliability ratings suggest that elements not included in the survey instrument impact these sources of motivation and the decision not to apply.

Why People Don't Apply for the Superintendency

At first blush, the pool of potential applicants in the Pacific Northwest appears to be adequate to meet the immediate need for superintendents in the region. But, once the pool was disaggregated, the data revealed that 44% of its members were either already retired or planned to retire in the near future. And, of those who could be considered potential applicants only 35% (130) actually planned to apply. Clearly, aspects of the superintendency served as disincentives to the remaining 240 potential superintendent aspirants.

The reasons not to apply are certainly tinged with some of the negative aspects of the superintendency (factor one) that could be attributed, at least in part, to the power that attends the position. If the need for power (McClellend) in superintendent aspirants is

low and their levels of self-esteem (Maslow) are sufficiently high, otherwise qualified individuals may simply choose not to apply.

In addition, negative aspects of the superintendency, such as poor media image, politics, and so forth coupled with a low pay differential from their current positions, may suggest that the rewards (Adams) do not justify the effort they would have to expend in doing the job. Potential applicants may even believe that no matter how much effort they put forth, they would not be effective–that the job is impossible to do (Vroom). In addition, some may feel that they lack the requisite abilities to be effective (factor two). Finally, other considerations, such as family and personal balance, (factor three) could outweigh any potential reward that the superintendency has to offer.

Potential superintendents entered educational professions because they wanted to work with children, could make time for family, and, at the same time, garner respect (Maslow). Working with parents and the general public is not the same as working with children. Superintendents work year-round and are on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week (Holcomb, 1987), leaving little time for family. The lack of job security also seems to be an issue. Consequently, the disincentives that surround today's superintendency may outweigh any need for achievement (McClellend) and self-actualization (Maslow).

A further examination using social learning theory suggests other possible explanations as well. Fifty-five percent of the viable pool were either high school principals, assistant superintendents, or central administrators. Close proximity to superintendents in their districts might afford them the opportunity to learn vicariously. After observing superintendents in action, they may have decided that the job was not as attractive as it first seemed and not worth the added effort on their part that doing it well

would require. Similarly, they could have anticipated problems and how they, as superintendents, might deal with them and drawn the conclusion that they were not prepared to deal with the daily tension and stress of the position. Any of these conclusions could easily lead them to engage in a little self-control and simply not apply.

The Dilemma Northwest Districts Face

Adequate candidate pools afford school districts that are looking for superintendents the opportunity to scrutinize several candidates, which increases the possibility of hiring a superintendent who is a good match for the district. Whether the disincentives that surround the superintendency derive from content, process-related, or socially learned factors, the result is the same. Fewer qualified applicants who want the position exist than are needed to generate such pools in the Pacific Northwest. While the data and the analysis provided by this study did not uncover all the reasons why this is the case, they point to one troublesome reality–the job itself does not appear to be a very attractive career option. Politics, the media, boards with individually vested interests, certainly sound dissuasive to the uninitiated. But, public participation and public scrutiny have always been part and parcel of the American school system–combined, they remain its greatest strength. Pay has become an issue; it appears that for many, schools cannot pay enough to convince qualified individuals to sacrifice their personal lives for the sake of their professional ones. Is the job too big? Does public scrutiny verge on private intrusion? Does the amount of time and energy needed to do the job effectively impinge on the individual's right to have a private life? These are questions many districts have yet to answer.

The most pervasive reasons for not applying–media image (expanded and sometimes less than flattering) and fluctuating relationships with communities and boards–suggest a need to rebuild trust with the media, communities, and boards and, perhaps, rethink the role of school boards and how they are selected. Doing so, might relieve some of the stress that is associated with position instability, politicking, inadequate school funding, and inequitable compensation packages (factor one). In addition, districts might need to identify leaders within their ranks at younger ages and provide better mentoring for them (factor two). And, it could be that school districts need to recognize that they will continue to have an aging superintendency unless the position can be restructured in a way that affords a better balance between professional and personal lives for superintendents (factor three).

For many potential applicants, the number one reason for not applying for the superintendency was that they enjoyed what they were currently doing. Even though over 90% of superintendents in the Cooper, Fusarelli, Carella study found their work satisfying, only 65% would recommend that aspiring administrators take the position. Why? One has to ask: Does finding one's work satisfying necessarily mean the same as finding it enjoyable? How many current superintendents, if they had the chance to do it over again, would also be among the "will not apply" segment of the potential applicant pool? In the Pacific Northwest, districts must ask: Does a viable applicant pool exist, or is it a mere illusion? A phantom pool, at best? The answer seems obvious, the solution to the problem less so.

References

Adams, J. S. (1963, November). Toward an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 422-36.

Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings*. New York: The Free Press.

American Council on Education, (1990). *The American freshman national norms for fall 1990.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bauman, G. (1990). Untitled monograph. Tallahassee: College of Education, Florida State University.

Berg, O., Coker, W., & Reno,T (1992) Motivation factors for careers in teaching, *NCA Quarterly 66*(3), Winter.

Bowditch, J. L. & Buono, A. F. (1997). *A primer on organizational behavior, 4th ed.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Clarke, R. & Keating, W.F., (1995) A fresh look at teacher job Satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Anaheim, Ca.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Carella, V. A. (2000). *Career crisis in the school superintendency? The results of a national survey*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Dillman D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dlugosh, L.(1994). *Why administrators move: Factors contributing to the turnover of school administrators in Nebraska*. Lincoln, NE: The Department of Educational Administration.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J. & Foleno, T. A. (2000). *A sense of calling: Who teaches and why, a report from the public agenda*. NY: New York.

Fuller, L. (1990). *Restructuring educational systems: Key organizational factors affecting teaching development and motivation*. Unpublished manuscript, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Forsyth, P. (1999). *The school administrator supply*. Columbia, MO: Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Glass, T. E. (1992). *The 1992 study of the American school superintendency: America's education in a time of reform*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T. E., Björk, L. & Brunner, C. (2000). *The 2000 study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1992). *Multivariate data analysis with readings, 3rd ed.* New York: Macmillan, pp. 236-237.

Harris, S., Arnold, M., Lowery, S & Crocker, C. (2000, Winter). Deciding to become a principal: What factors motivate or inhibit that decision. *ERS Spectrum*, pp. 44-45.

Holcomb, J. H. (1987). Boards must urge promising young school leaders to step forward. *American School Board Journal 174*(5), 32-33.

Houston, P.D. (June 3, 1998). The ABC's of administrative shortages. Commentary, *Education Week*, 44, 32.

Jordan, D. W., McCauley, H. S., and Comeaux, J. B. (1994). *The supply and demand trends of public school principal and administrators in southwestern Louisiana:* 1993-1997. ERIC Document: ED 375-525.

Lawler, E. E. III (1994). *Motivation in work organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, (1990). *Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher*. New York: Metropolitan Life.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (1996). Minutes from the November meeting.

Noursis, M. J. (1994). *SPSS professional statistics 6.1*. Chicago: SPSS, Inc., pp.151-154.

O'Connell, J. J. (1992). *Snapshot of the superintendency*. New York: Council of School Superintendents.

Parkay F. W. & Hall, G. (1992). *Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership*.

Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Price, J. (1992). *The school administrator supply and demand report*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Rawls, S. L. (1998). *Career aspirations: A study of superintendent certificate holders in Washington Sate in 1997*. Unpublished manuscript. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wolverton, M. Rawls, S. & Macdonald, R. T. (2000). *The Superintendent Pool: Realities in the Northwest*. Pullman, WA: Center for Academic Leadership, Washington State University.

Wolverton, M., Rawls, S. L., Macdonald, R. T. & Nelson, S. (2000). *School leadership in the northwest: factors that determine whether certificate holders apply for the superintendency*. Paper presentation. Albuquerque: UCEA Conference.

Table 1: Profile of the Viable Pool for the Northwest

Variable	Pool (371)	Male (252)	Female (119)
Male	68%		
Female	32%		
Minority	7%	8%	7%
Average Age	50 years	50 years	51 years
Masters Plus	60%	61%	51%
Doctorate	36%	33%	41%
Certified	all but 1	all but 1	all
Mean Certification Year	1988	1987	1990
Years Administrative Experience	143/4 years	15 3/4 years	12 2/3 years
Average Years in Present Position	6 years	6 years	<5 ½ years
Current Position			
Elementary Principal	22%	21%	23%
High School Principal	16%	19%	10%
Assistant Superintendent	18%	18%	17%
Central Administrator	31%	28%	36%
Other Administrator	19%	16%	21%
School Size			
<2000	29%	33%	23%
2000-9999	37%	36%	40%
>10,000	33%	32%	36%
Applied for Superintendency in Past	64% (184 of 287)	77% (144 of 188)	38% (38 of 99)
Interviewed	73% (135 of 184)	75% (105 of 144)	71% (27 of 38)
Attained Superintendency	83% (112 of 135)	94% (101of 105)	41% (11 of 27)
Plan to Apply	35% (**131** of 371)	39% (98 of 252)	28% (33 of 119)
Do not Plan to Apply	65% (**240** of 371)	61% (154 of 252)	72% (86 of 119)
Enjoy Current Position (5 point scale)	3.91	3.94	3.86

Table 2: Reasons for Not Applying Inventory Principal Components Factor Analysis (using data from the 240 subjects in the viable pool who will not apply)

Variable	Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings F1	F2	F3
Undesirability of Position			
Media image of superintendents	**.74**	.21	-.21
Fluctuating relationships with the community	**.72**	.16	.03
Engaging in ongoing relationships with school boards	**.68**	.02	.12
Stress	**.68**	.24	-.02
Insecurity of superintendent position	**.67**	.36	.05
Politics of administration	**.63**	.32	-.20
Addressing collective bargaining issues	**.61**	.10	.02
Unstable financing of state's public schools	**.58**	-.04	.18
Low pay differential from current position	**.48**	-.16	.20
Cronbach's alpha	**.84**		
Individual Support & Image Issues			
Lack of mentor support	.09	**.83**	-.01
Lack of self-confidence	.11	**.79**	.14
Weak certification program	.17	**.67**	.08
Lack of affirmative action	.09	**.49**	-.21
Cronbach's alpha		**.68**	
Family Considerations			
Place bound	.00	-.01	**.75**
Spouse's job	.18	-.02	**.70**
Children at home	-.02	.0	**.69**
Cronbach's alpha			**.58**
Eigenvalue	4.5	1.9	1.6
Percent of variance accounted for	28.2	11.9	10.2
Cumulative percent of variance accounted for			50.3

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Northwest's Phantom Pool: Superintendent certificate holders who Do Not Plan to Apply and why	
Author(s): Mimi Wolverton And R. Timothy Macdonald	
Corporate Source: UNLV	Publication Date: April 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Mimi Wolverton	Printed Name/Position/Title: Mimi Wolverton / Assoc. Professor	
Organization/Address: 4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453002 Las Vegas, NV 89154-3002	Telephone: 702-895-1432	FAX: 702-895-3492
	E-Mail Address: mimi.wolverton@cc.mail.nevada.edu	Date: 4-16-02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)